REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and is responsive to the Office Action of February 21, 2008, in which claims 1-5 and 11-20 are presently pending. Of those, claims 1-4, 11-14, 16 and 18-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0174218 of Dick, et al. In addition, claims 5, 15 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick, in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0233420 of Stark, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the arguments presented by the Applicants in the prior response of November 26, 2007 are not persuasive for the reasons that: (1) Dick's "application" header could purportedly be associated with the header of the SOAP application 208 in FIG. 2, and Dick's data extractor function purportedly builds/generates message/meta-data with semantic meanings to other message data; (2) the claimed SOAP message header/body attributes are purportedly "inherent" in a SOAP application, as reflected in the additional Scribner reference; and (3) that Dick purportedly teaches interpreting and processing the content of the message body associated with the message header, using the meta-data and semantics included in the message header itself, because Dick teaches the use of SOAP protocol and XML to allow programs to communicate with programs anywhere.

In response, the Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the following relevant portions of the specification, which discuss the differences between standard SOAP messages using static information/well known schema (i.e., inflexible data with no type information associated with the message) and flexible SOAP messages described using an XML schema using the 'any' construct (i.e., flexible data descriptions, but still

6

un-typed, therefore imposing a number of restrictions on existing message processing frameworks):

"[0002] Most service oriented computer network systems use Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) as an encoding mechanism, and therefore Extensible Markup Language (XML) as the underlying message format. Normally, messages transferred between the client and the service and both parties follow a message format known to both of them such that they can determine the message type and map it to their type system. This determination is typically based on static information such a well-known schema (e.g., published by standard bodies), some previous agreement on the schema (e.g., published by the service provider in a service description such as WSDL), or using a standard set of application programming interfaces. There are also other cases wherein the XML schema information and types are embedded with the message, and the framework knows how to interpret the message. Such characteristics are acceptable for most of the presently utilized message exchange patterns where both the parties are familiar with one other and the message(s) exchanged therebetween."

"[0003] On the other hand, it is also desirable to be able to support a message exchange pattern wherein both client and server are flexible such that messages may be sent without being bound to a previous agreement on the schema. Although "open-content" XML schemas are available by using the XML "any" type definition extension, there is still a semantic problem (i.e., meaning and use of the data) associated with flexible, open-content message data. This problem is driven by the static nature of the data and "a priori" agreements between both parties in the exchange pattern. Accordingly, it would be advantageous to be able to exchange semantic type information dynamically along with the message, but without disturbing the exchange pattern."

None of the references of record teach or suggest solving the problem addressed by the present application, nor do they teach or suggest anything beyond conventional

SOAP message formatting, which is already discussed in the Applicants' specification by way of background.

Notwithstanding, in the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended as set forth above to more particularly point out that the SOAP header includes "message meta-data and semantic type information describing at least a portion of the content of the SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantic type information included in the SOAP message header, thereby facilitating a dynamic exchange of semantic type information and meta-data information for open content message exchange between a sender and the receiver." Support for the present amendment is found at least in paragraph [0013] of the specification.

With regard to the §102 rejections of independent claims 1 and 11, the Applicants again maintain that Dick fails to teach each element of the claims as presently worded. Applicants have in fact considered the references as a whole, and not just the cited passages. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Dick's SOAP pluggable unraveler 208 captures and processes SOAP headers, the data extractor 210 is described as capturing whether "two elements in the message have a semantic relationship" (paragraph [0037]). This is not the same as what is being claimed in the instant application, namely that the SOAP header includes message meta-data and semantic type information describing at least a portion of the content of the SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantic type information included in the SOAP message header, thereby facilitating a dynamic exchange of semantic type information and meta-data information for open content message exchange between a sender and the receiver.

Thus, even if Dick's data extractor is capable of building/generating message/meta-data with semantic meanings to other message data, it is still left to a service to handle the semantics. However, the service would need prior knowledge of the message in order to

8

properly process and parse the message, where the message is an un-typed (open content) format. This being the case, Dick does not disclose facilitating a <u>dynamic exchange of semantic type information</u> and meta-data information for open content message exchange between a sender and the receiver.

Therefore, because Dick fails to teach each and every element of claims 1 and 11, the claims are not anticipated by Dick. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the applicable §102 rejections of the remaining claims have been overcome. Furthermore, since the Stark reference also fails to teach or suggest the missing claim elements described above, the §103 rejection of claims 5, 15 and 17 has also been overcome.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
JOSHY JOSEPH, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By ___/Sean F. Sullivan/_____
      Sean F. Sullivan
      Registration No. 38,328
      Customer No. 46429

Date: May 21, 2008
Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929